

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MARIO THREATS,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

TRANS UNION, LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-00357-CDS-NJK

ORDER

11 Pending before the Court is an order for Plaintiff to show cause why Defendants Experian
12 and Clarity should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Docket No. 20. Plaintiff filed a
13 response indicating that the parties were discussing settlement, so Plaintiff agreed not to take any
14 action despite the expiration of the deadline to respond to the complaint. Docket No. 21. As the
15 response itself identifies, however, the Court has already rejected that line of reasoning.
16 Moreover, the instant response promises to change course “[m]oving forward,” *id.* at 3, but no
17 explanation is provided as to why that change was not made when the prior order admonishing
18 counsel was issued weeks ago. As a final courtesy to counsel, the Court will discharge this order
19 to show cause with only a further admonishment. To be clear, there will be no more leniency for
20 promises of change “moving forward.” Counsel would be well advised to review their open cases
21 to ensure that they are complying with their obligations now. **Counsel should expect sanctions**
22 **will be imposed for similar issues arising after today’s date.**

23 If Defendants have not responded to the complaint, Plaintiff’s request for default must be
24 filed by May 12, 2025.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: May 6, 2025

27
28


Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge